

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ORGANIZED LABOR AND THE  
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: POLI-  
CIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1986

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent home district work period, I had the privilege of participating in the annual education seminar of the United Auto Workers Local 887. That setting offered me an opportunity to focus my thoughts on the relationship that should exist among organized labor, industry, and the Government. We all want this country to prosper, but we, perhaps, have different ideas about how to go about accomplishing that end. In the hope that my reflections might be helpful to my colleagues in provoking further discussion and further reflection on ways to forge the strongest relations among these sectors, I insert my comments in the RECORD at this point.

AEROSPACE, AEROSPACE WORKERS AND  
AEROSPACE POLICY

Three years ago, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Technology, I was briefed on Japanese progress in aerospace. I learned that Japan would be capable of entering the expendable launch vehicle arena within just a few years. Time has shown that their estimate was about right. They recently launched their H-1 vehicle carrying three small payloads. That vehicle can carry no more than 500 kilograms of payload. One might scoff and say that is an insignificant lift capacity. But there are companies that need no greater capacity than that. Our expendables and the shuttles can carry well over 2,000 kilograms. But the Japanese plan to develop their second generation of vehicles, the H-2's and to launch the first one about the time we hope to be launching the Challenger replacement. If the H-2 is capable of launching 2,500 kilograms, then in the H-1 and the H-2 Japan will have the potential to compete across the weight range required by commercial customers.

At about the same time that I was briefed on Japanese progress in aerospace, I also received information that some components of missiles made for U.S. military use had no adequate suppliers in the United States. The most reliable suppliers for these parts were in Japan. As I recall, the parts in question were specialized, extremely sophisticated microchips.

The particular part that was in short supply domestically is immaterial. The matter of more importance is the implication of overseas development in aerospace for the U.S. aerospace industry and for aerospace workers in the United States. Could Japan be competing for many of your jobs in the next two decades?

Observers of Japan might make the point that there has been no hint from Japan

that it plans to commercialize its launch vehicles. So far, the payloads have been exclusively for the government. But one has to look beyond what has not been said to what has been done. Japan has been officially, even passionately, involved in space research and development since 1970. Japan now supports to the tune of about 800 million dollars per year a vast space launch infrastructure that makes only perhaps three launches per year. Japan's space launch needs would be much more adequately served by purchasing space on other vehicles. The cost of the infrastructure is unjustified if its sole use will be to launch government payloads. Commercial competition will be a necessity if the infrastructure is ever to become cost effective. It is significant that Japanese policy in aerospace has been clear, strong, and single-minded.

It is also worth noting that Japan has had a balanced program of development over the 26 years it has been active in the field. That is, it has developed ground facilities including and tracking facilities. It has developed launch vehicles, and it has developed technological expertise to ensure continued, steady development—even to the point that it makes some missile parts as good or better than we do. Down the road that means not just that Japan could be a competitor in aerospace but that it is developing the capability to be a strong competitor.

I do not mean to dwell on the case of Japan. I want to use it only to make some observations about the nature of aerospace development and about the jobs that are supported by aerospace industry. The first observation is that aerospace development is heavily dependent on government policy and, initially at least, on strong government support through purchase of aerospace products or through subsidies in support of commercial sales. This has been true of the Japanese space program, the Chinese program, Ariane the European program, and it has certainly been true of the United States and Russian programs.

When both policy and support are clear and strong, development is steady and successful. We see that happening now in Japan. And we saw it in the case of the United States at least through the Apollo phase of the space program. The second observation I want to suggest is that when government policy about aerospace is not clear and strong, development, and with it, jobs, can be significantly and adversely affected. When that risk is immanent, those whose jobs are at stake have a responsibility to play a meaningful role in the policy debate.

As I said, the United States policy through the end of Apollo was clear. It was to develop and launch the technology to put a man on the moon. At the conclusion of the Apollo program, I believe the United States began to be a victim of its own success. The most critical observers say that our space program had no clear purpose or goals after Apollo. One apparent indication of the flagging sense of purpose was that the money started to dry up. I cannot pre-

tend to be an expert on aerospace policy, but I did participate in the debate during the four years I spent on the House Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications and on the Transportation, Aviation, and Materials Subcommittee. These two Subcommittees are responsible for the policy making role of the House in the area of non-military space activities. From my experience on those Subcommittees, I would depart a bit from the harshest critics and say that after Apollo the United States did not so much lose direction, as gain many directions.

Often, to develop is to become more complex. But in the case of aerospace policy, the various United States policies after Apollo were and still are at odds with each other. That is a problem. In fact, it may be the problem in aerospace today. Ultimately, that set of conflicting policies has implications for you, the aerospace workers, because each policy orients your work in a different direction. And if one policy direction does finally win out, that policy will determine the amount and kind of work that will be available to you.

Since Apollo, there have been at least four competing policies with respect to aerospace. And in addition to those competing policies, there has been a somewhat extraneous consideration that has nothing to do with aerospace particularly and yet affects it profoundly. That is the government-wide drive to cut spending in order to bring the deficit under control without raising taxes. The four competing aerospace policies may be identified as military, commercial, aeronautical, and scientific. The forces at play in the formation of each of these policies are far too complex to describe in any detail here. I will have to describe even the major conflicts only broadly. It is important to see, however, that while these competing positions battle each other here, there is an opportunity for more single-minded foreign competitors to take firmer hold of a business that was once our exclusive domain in the non-Communist world.

As I said, overshadowing the battle and making it more intense is the push to curb spending and to not raise taxes. That push has placed limits on the money available to carry out programmatic policies across all of government. The hard nose businessman would react to such a constraint by killing some programs to let other thrive. Congress is not a hard nosed businessman. It has been reluctant to end some government endeavors in order to more adequately support others. The result is that a host of programs survive in an inadequate state. And aerospace as a singular goal directed activity is one of these inadequately funded areas. Congress is letting four policies live in conflict but cannot afford to let any of them flourish.

One measure in the move to economize was the decision not to maintain an expendable launch vehicle capability, and, instead, to place all hope in the shuttle. Once the shuttle was operative, the military began to see that the shuttle was going to be pressed

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

to meet military demand for launches given that the shuttle was also to become self-supporting through the sale of space to commercial interests. But launching satellites is not the only interest of the military in aerospace. A side consideration was and is that the military would like more money to produce and deploy, sea, and air launched nuclear missiles and to steeply increase research and development of the hardware and software involved in the Strategic Defense Initiative. All three types of endeavor draw from the pot of money for space development. To the extent that other related agencies of government such as NASA take money from the same finite source, the military has that much less to devote to its projects.

One reaction on the part of the military to the recognition of insufficient shuttle space was their decision to redevelop an expendable launch capability. I am just speculating here, but a second reaction may be the recent discussion within the executive branch about the desirability of turning all government controlled launch capability over to exclusively government use. Doing this would solve the military problem by removing the government from the business of providing civilian, commercial launch services and by effectively turning NASA, which now represents civilian space development, over to military purposes. Just as an aside, it might also have the secondary adverse effect of turning all commercial launch business over to Europe, China and Japan if the embryonic U.S. commercial launch businesses are left to compete with government subsidized overseas competitors.

I have tried to give a very broad sketch of military considerations in the aerospace policy debate. NASA, on the other hand, in negotiating funding for the shuttle had made the argument that the shuttle would eventually begin to pay for itself through the sale of commercial space on the shuttle. So, NASA has been trying to make sales while the military has been both demanding a substantial share of the available shuttle space (while reserving the right to back out if it chooses) and preparing its own backup over and above the Vandenberg military shuttle launch site. In order to insure that the shuttle can be commercially successful, NASA needs some place for the companies that would agree to manufacture in space to work. NASA needs the space station. Military officials have said repeatedly that they have no pressing use for a space station. Scientists say they could do their work better without the space station. The space station is a perfect example of the kind of policy competition that has gone on among the aerospace rivals. Each competitor is protecting its own priorities.

The aeronautical portion of aerospace, like the space portion, is also divided between the military and NASA. While civilian aeronautics has received a small amount of money compared to civilian space, the money has been fairly steady and has allowed research on improvements in engine design and even on improved methods of surface transportation. The military aeronautics budget has been until recently fairly distinct from civilian aeronautics. The two have not been in the kind of direct competition that has been the case in space. Rather, the competition up to now has been between aeronautics and space. Space has won the lion's share of civilian aerospace dollars

and aeronautics has fared better on the military side with the development of the B1 and the Stealth technology.

Again, I am just speculating, but the rivalry between aeronautics and space may be changing. The most recent development in aeronautics has been the space plane. It may change the nature of the relationship between military and civilian aeronautics because funding for the project is to be divided between the military and NASA and the two are to work together in its development. The cost estimate for the project is hard to get, and speculation has gone as high as 180 billion dollars. The effect of this new development in the aerospace policy competition is unpredictable right now. But it should be watched closely since it may lead to a turning point in the aeronautics versus space dichotomy. In a sense, the United States started up this path once, with the supersonic transport, and then turned back. What will happen this time is anyone's guess.

Of the four policy competitors, Space science has been the recent underdog. Hardware considerations for both the shuttle and for practical application of communications and surveillance technology in space by the military have repeatedly taken precedence over scientific applications. And in the past few years, science related to near rather than deep space has been favored. The deep space probes that have recently given us information about the outlying planets were launched many years ago and were adapted to their most recent missions after having long since completed their intended purposes.

So, in brief, these are the issues and the players in the four way rivalry for dominance in U.S. aerospace policy in a time of fiscal restraint.

Now, I suspect that if you ask aerospace workers whether they want to work on space telescopes and deep space probes for scientists, or shuttles and satellites and space stations for commercial applications, or space planes and advanced jet engines for aeronautical interests, or expendable launch vehicles and missiles and the Strategic Defense Initiative for the military, they would say "all of the above". The purpose of my forcing you to march quickly through competing aerospace policies and the demands of fiscal restraint with a sidelong glance at the inroads foreign competitors are poised to make is to say that unfortunate as it may be, "all of the above" is likely not to be one of the options. As individual citizens you have told your lawmakers that you do not want to pay more taxes. You want the government to quit giving money to everything and, instead, to exercise restraint. That is the message that brought us to Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. It is the message that brought us to a tax reform that will not raise new revenue but that will shift some of the tax burden to businesses in order to lighten the load on individuals. It is the message that has become a loaded gun pointed at the heads of politicians.

We want to say yes to everyone because that is what keeps us in our jobs. But the voters are giving us incompatible messages. Our solution has been basically to give out just as many pieces of the spending pie, but to make the pieces smaller. Unfortunately, some sectors cannot function on the monetary diet we have to offer. They survive but have difficulty producing.

Aerospace now runs the risk of surviving but not flourishing. And you may be assured

that competitors wait in the wings for the weakening of the U.S. industry. A new shuttle, restarting expendable launch vehicle production lines, building military satellites, building a space station, developing space planes, building telescopes, building missiles, developing the Strategic Defense Initiative—there are not enough resources to fund them all adequately. How do we choose?

It is your jobs we are trying to make policy decisions about. Unfortunately we are less influenced by the demands of sound policy than by the need to make everyone at least a little bit happy. I think it is time that the UAM and the other unions representing aerospace workers begin to take a substantive part in the aerospace policy debate. Supporting jobs in aerospace must become much more than negotiating wage and work agreements with the aerospace companies. You and they are both being pushed and pulled in the policy debate. To represent labor must now take on a broader meaning than it did in the past. If aerospace jobs are to be maintained within a sound aerospace industry and not turned over to the foreign competitors that dearly want a shot at those jobs, then, together, labor, industry, and government must arrive at sound decisions about overall aerospace policy.

Is it a good idea to turn all government space efforts over to military and government applications? How great a return can be expected from stimulating the commercial development of space? How likely is it that domestic commercial space businesses will develop without government help in a competitive atmosphere where all overseas rivals have at least some government subsidy? Does the knowledge gained from scientific endeavor in space justify its cost? Is it better for long-range development of space to build a shuttle or to build a space plane? In short, how and to what end should we use space?

These are the policy questions. It is the answers to these questions that will determine not only what the aerospace jobs of the future will be but whether there will be aerospace jobs in the United States at all. While your effort to support compatible candidates for Congressional office can go some distance toward making your views known, it is time to do more. You must go beyond the question of jobs to the question of nature of those jobs. In the end, my message to you can be simply stated: nothing will go so far toward supporting aerospace jobs than the serious participation of the UAW and other unions representing aerospace workers in the substantive debate over what U.S. aerospace policy should be. The policy will either create the jobs, change them, or destroy them.

While I realize that those asked to speak here at this educational seminar are meant to deliver the educational addresses, I hope to come away from here having learned a great deal from all of you. I am honored to have the opportunity to address you. But I will be even more honored if you will take time here today to talk back to me. I have done nothing more than to describe a debate and pose some of the questions and considerations in that debate. You have the hard part. I'm asking you to give the answers.



CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO  
THE DAUGHTERS OF MIRIAM  
CENTER FOR THE AGED UPON  
THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
ITS FOUNDING

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1986

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, this year the Daughters of Miriam Center for the Aged, which is located in the city of Clifton, my congressional district and State of New Jersey, celebrated its 65th anniversary of outstanding services dedicated to the pursuit of happiness and security for people, and particularly our senior citizens. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the distinguished officers, trustees, staff and community leaders who have actively participated in the organization and administration of one of the most prestigious care and activities centers for senior citizens in our Nation, the Daughters of Miriam Center for the Aged.

Mr. Speaker, the exemplary leadership and outstanding efforts of our citizens so important to our quality of life are in the vanguard of the American dream. As we commemorate this 65th anniversary celebration, we express our appreciation to the officers and trustees of the Daughters of Miriam Center for the Aged, composed of business and professional men and women, who through their fidelity, devotion and personal commitment over the years have provided intelligent direction and dedication toward achieving the goals and purposes of the center—to help our elderly attain the best possible quality of life in their golden years.

The current officers and members of the board of trustees are as follows:

OFFICER AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Honorable Melvin Opper, president; Samuel S. Schwartz, honorary president; Milton Werksman, honorary president; Arthur Bodner, past president; Helen G. Deich, past president; Arnold H. Goodman, past president; Leonard Kohl, past president; Saul Rosen, past president; Alexander E. Rosenthal, past president; Joel J. Steiger, past president; Milton Kleinman, senior vice president; Philip E. Sarna, vice president; H. Louis Chodosh, MD, vice president; Monroe Potash, vice president; Jack Birnberg, vice president; Peter Rosenthal, treasurer; George Kramer, assistant treasurer; Morris Yammer, secretary; Norman Koch, assistant secretary; Harvey Adelsberg, M.P.A., F.A.C.H.A., executive vice president; Richard Abramson, William Adler, Jerry Atkins, Warren G. Bauer, Stanley Berenzweig, Gerard Berman, Irving Blank, Claire Blazer, Samuel Bograd, Marge Bornstein, Samson Bosin, Louis Brawer, William Brawer, Benson J. Chapman, Irving B. Cohen, Sylvia Cohen, Steven Cohen, MD, Stuart Coven, Hy Derfler, Murray Deutsch, Saul Dobrow, Herman D. Edelson, Eva Feld, Benjamin Friedman, Sandor Garfinkle, Dr. Solomon Geld, Benjamin Geller, Mel Gerstein, Merrill Gitkin, Lawrence Goldman, Henriette Goldstein, Lawrence Gurtman, Howard Honigfeld, Lewis L. Immerman, M.D., Rabbi Dr. Leon Katz, Martin Kenwood, Arnold

Klein, O.D. (ex officio), Herbert C. Klein, David Kluger, Peter Kolben, Sanford Komito, Arthur Kramer, Richard Lane, Ronald S. Mack, Leonard Marcus, Mollie Nalanbogen, Harold Peimer, Howard Phillips, Alan S. Prell, Sylvia Richman (ex-officio), Martin Rosen, Jerry Rosenblum, Eugene Rosensweet, Richard Rosenthal, Irving K. Ruttenburg, Helen Sanders, Walter Sanders, Ruth Schlam (ex-officio), Louis E. Schotz, Ruth Schwartz (ex-officio), Sidney Shelov, Rose Shulman, Minerva Stark (ex-officio), Julius M. Sucoff, DDS, Martin Sukenick, Robert J. Topchik, David Waldman, Ruth Weisenfeld, Steven Wener, Ben Weiner, Naomi Wilzig, Sigi Wilzig, Samuel Wolff, Norman Zelnick.

I particularly commend to you the administrator and executive vice president of the Daughters of Miriam Center for the Aged, Harvey Adelsberg, a fellow of the American College of Hospital Administrators, who has responded with the highest standards of excellence in helping to improve the lives and services of the people entrusted to his care.

Mr. Speaker, the Daughters of Miriam Center for the Aged is a nonprofit organization, governed by a philanthropic board of trustees, supported through the generosity of the Jewish communities of Paterson, Passaic, Clifton, Fair Lawn, and environs.

The center was established in 1921 through a gift from the Honorable Nathan Barnert, two-term mayor of Paterson and well-known philanthropist, in memory of his wife Miriam. It has progressed over the years from a shelter for aged persons and orphaned children, Home for the Aged and Orphans, through its gradual transition to Home and Infirmary for the Aged, and its ultimate expansion and transformation to one of the leading facilities of excellence in the field of care for the elderly—The Daughters of Miriam Center for the Aged. It is licensed by the New Jersey State Department of Health, accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals and the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities, and approved by the American Dental Association. The facility and its programs comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in admission and personnel policies. Daughters of Miriam is college and university-affiliated as a teaching and in-service training center.

The facilities and services included in this complex are a 340-bed medical and nursing care center, the Brawer Building and the Esther and Sam Schwartz Building, apartment residences comprising 270 units, which provide congregate services to older persons capable of independent living, a medical day care center for the elderly for seniors who are in need of social and medical services, and the Fred Ables Memorial Sheltered Workshop. In total they serve 650 aged persons in a given day.

Mr. Speaker, the original purpose of the center was to give sheltered care to both the aged and to orphaned children. The first location was in a converted house in Paterson, and after the initial 5 years, in a 50-bed capacity building on an estate in Clifton. This dual program for the underprivileged at both extremes of the age spectrum remained unchanged for over 20 years. In the following 45 years, the program for dependent children was relinquished to a professional casework

agency which placed them in foster or adoptive homes. The Daughters of Miriam merged with the B'nai Israel Home for the Aged in Passaic, and a growing partnership of government and philanthropy in the funding of care through the introduction of Medicare and Medicaid and Federal loans for major structures evolved. The high standards of care at Daughters of Miriam have a direct connection with the philosophy of its professional and lay leaders. They believe that a geriatric facility must approximate as closely as possible a client's former home environment. It must provide skilled nursing and medical services but, even more urgently, it must offer a congenial atmosphere in which the residents can carry on the activities of daily living which are so important to the senior citizens.

A unique establishment within the Daughters of Miriam community is the Fred Ables Memorial Workshop. In effect, this sheltered work activities program is a self-contained industry, the purpose of which is to provide occupational therapy for many of the aged residents on assembly jobs for contracting commercial companies. The workshop also employs certain handicapped community members. It is licensed by the U.S. Department of Labor and workers are paid at rates approved by the Department, but more important, the participants are given the self-assurance that comes with still being able to do useful work and to make an independent contribution toward their own maintenance.

According to their capabilities and interests, residents take part in a broad variety of daily living and social activities—arts and crafts in special rooms or in rooms on the infirmary floors; cooking and baking programs; bingo games; music programs; religious observance; watching television; relaxing in the solarium overlooking the busy Garden State Parkway; and walking or visiting with friends in the gardens. Local groups such as the Passaic/Clifton, Paterson, and Fair Lawn women's auxiliaries come in to visit patients, and volunteer in a number of departments. Parties are held in the auditorium for residents on their special anniversaries. Cookouts and picnics in the center grounds are regular features of the summer months. Frequent tours to the larger community are arranged for the more active apartment tenants.

Considerable time is given, of course, to therapy sessions and medical checkups. A qualified staff of over 400 people, including resident and attending physicians are available 24 hours per day, 365 days a year. Also on the staff are a psychiatrist, physiotherapist, pharmacist, medical technicians, registered graduate and licensed practical nurses, nurses' aides, and orderlies. Over half of the members of the staff are specialists in medical and nursing care. The full program of intensive care for residents is rounded out by specialists in podiatry, optometry, dentistry, physical therapy, speech therapy and audiology.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to call this 65th anniversary celebration to your attention and seek this national recognition of the outstanding services provided by the officers, trustees, staff and professional men and women of the Daughters of Miriam over the

past decades. Their dedication and devotion in helping our seniors to maintain their dignity and help find happiness and independence in their golden years have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. We do indeed salute the Daughters of Miriam on their 65th anniversary and extend our best wishes for their continued good works and success in all of their future endeavors.

## SOVIET ALLIES IN THE ANTI-SDI EFFORT

### HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, columnist William F. Buckley wonders why the Soviet Union's fight against President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative has been joined not only by the usual crowd of unilateralists but by such hard-headed "realists" as Mel Laird and Brent Scowcroft. In the following column that question is not answered, but the writer has performed an important service by describing the new coalition of radical liberals and "realist" conservatives who want to shelve the most idealistic proposal for defensive weapons in years in order to continue the folly of one-sided adherence to the strategy of mutual assured destruction.

From Buckley's column we should recognize that deploying a strategic defense of our people and cities from accidental or deliberate attack is not a political issue of right versus left, it is a moral issue of right versus wrong.

I recommend this column to my colleagues.

[August 21, 1986]

## SOVIETS GAIN SURPRISING ALLIES ON SPACE SHIELD

(By William Buckley)

Once again, we have those big-name advisers counseling the President in effect to abandon his Strategic Defense Initiative. But this time around there are two names not usually associated with the soft school on Soviet diplomacy; Melvin Laird's and, most conspicuously, Brent Scowcroft's. They in effect signed a 3,500-word paper address to the President by Harold Brown, who served President Carter as secretary of defense.

What is going on?

The ABM treaty concluded in 1972 is variously interpreted. There are those who read in it a prohibition against testing the technology appropriate to the development of a space shield (SDI)—the "restrictive" interpretation. There are those who read it otherwise, the "permissive" reading. The question which of the two readings is correct would be moot if Mr. Reagan were to exercise his prerogative to call an end to the treaty.

For reasons of his own, Mr. Reagan has not exercised this prerogative. Instead, he has said he would go along with the restrictive reading for the simple reason that SDI has not reached the point where it becomes

relevant to ask finally which of the two meanings of the ABM treaty is binding.

Along comes the Soviet Union, in the course of those endless disarmament talks, with one of those modest proposals it specializes in. Why not, say the Russians, a) accept the restrictive interpretation, and b) extend the treaty for 20 years?

Mr. Reagan said no, no. But he did say that he would be willing to guarantee not to deploy any SDI weapon in less than seven-and-a-half years, but that he would wish to be free to test and develop during that period. The Soviet Union has, of course, taken the position that Mr. Reagan's alternative is outrageous. In a way, the Soviet Union is correct; Mr. Reagan should not give the Soviet Union what it is hotly engaged in transforming into a veto power over plans devised by America for the protection of America.

The Brown-Scowcroft memorandum advocates a ban on testing SDI for up to 10 years. Why? The reasons given are presumably that any precipitate success with our anti-missile technology would destabilize the current balance of terror. But this is one of those orthodox projections we have been following for over a generation, during which we traveled the road from massive strategic superiority to strategic inferiority.

Two aspects of the space shield program stand out. The first is its emancipating vision: The idea of liberating America from threats of massive destruction by creating a space shield as an alternative preferable to blowing up 100 million Russians. That is the visionary approach, and the principal engine behind the idealistic ascendancy of the SDI.

The second aspect of the space shield program is its awful vulnerability. It isn't vulnerable directly to Soviet pressures. But Soviet pressure hasn't in recent memory been as isolated as that. It equals a combination of Soviet plus American pressure. Now, one expects the fellow travelers and the softheaded set to rustle when a Soviet wind blows, but one doesn't expect it of such as Gen. Scowcroft, who three years ago headed the commission that told us we needed 100 MX missiles for the national security. Of these we have got none. And nothing in political life is more predictable than that what is happening to the MX will happen to the space shield if we put off financing it vigorously (the President asked for a 75 percent increase this year, got 30 percent; Brown-Scowcroft want 10 percent), testing it at full-speed-ahead, and moving fast toward deployment.

Are there conditions under which we might abandon SDI? Sure. If we reached an arms agreement the effect of which was to make it impossible for the Soviet Union to destroy the United States, then there would be no need for SDI. Henry Kissinger has more than once pointed out that the survival of SDI absolutely depends on its immunity from workaday negotiations with the Soviet Union, except as a component of a general agreement. SDI is the kind of thing one is willing to trade in return for, oh, Lenin's Tomb; or, more concretely, unmistakable evidence that the Soviet Union is done preparing for aggressive nuclear war. Those who argue to give it up before that time are doing the work of the Soviet Union.

## "PEACE EDUCATION": THE NEED FOR BALANCE

### HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1986

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues a copy of the letter that I sent, along with a bipartisan group of 21 other Members, to Education Secretary William Bennett on peace education. The letter was prompted by Andre Ryerson's article in the June 1986 issue of *Commentary* magazine which claimed that the teacher's guides used to prepare lessons for this new subject appear to be skewed to one end of the political spectrum. As you can see from Secretary Bennett's response, he also shares our concern.

I urge my colleagues to obtain a copy of the June 1986 issue of *Commentary* and read Andre Ryerson's article. If you agree that our educational system should be apolitical or, at least, present a balanced view, then I urge you to communicate your thoughts to your constituents and local education leaders.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, August 5, 1986.

HON. WILLIAM BENNETT,  
Secretary of Education,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY BENNETT: We are concerned about a new educational curriculum that is being implemented in several school districts across the nation.

The new curriculum is variably entitled "peace education," "peace studies," or "nuclear war education." Our concern is not that this subject is being taught to our nation's youth but that the presentation of this politically-charged subject matter appears to be skewed toward one end of the political spectrum. A recent article by Andre Ryerson published in *Commentary* magazine entitled, "The Scandal of 'Peace Education'" (see enclosed), examines several of the teachers' guides that are used to prepare lesson plans for this new subject. Mr. Ryerson's analysis indicates that all of the fifty or so teachers' guides in circulation represent "a very thin slice of the political spectrum." Since school curriculum should be politically neutral or balanced, this allegation is very serious and deserving of further inquiry.

We have examined two of the three guides cited in Mr. Ryerson's article. In our opinion, his article accurately describes the teachers' guides' political bias and the efforts by groups such as the Union of Concerned Scientists, the National Education Association, and the Educators for Social Responsibility to promote pacifism in our nation's schools. The aim of the teachers' guides is to overwhelm students with feelings of fear, horror, national shame, and righteous indignation so that the only emotional alternative is to give in to fear and threats and reject any notion of a military defense. Since the concept of deterrence depends on a balance of fear (of retaliation against aggression) and determination (to defend against aggression) to prevent war, any major imbalance in the equation will weaken the very system that has guaranteed the peace for over 40 years. The peace



educators try to enhance fear while weakening the determination of our youth to prevent aggression. The result is to replace "peace through strength" with "peace through capitulation."

Democracies have always been vulnerable to pacifist movements. While the Soviet Union only tolerates opposition movements that it sanctions, the United States allows freedom of speech for all. Although the Soviets have no independent peace movement of their own, they have not failed to exploit our freedom of speech by promoting peace activism in the West. Defectors from the Soviet Union have detailed that country's efforts to weaken the West's will to defend itself through these peace groups. In addition, during Congressional testimony in 1982 the Federal Bureau of Investigation listed several organizations operating in the United States as Soviet fronts dedicated to "peace." Pacifism, then, becomes a tool of war that is used by the Soviets to attain their political goals. The taxpayers should not be forced to provide a forum for the advancement of a particular political view in our nation's public schools.

The new "peace" curriculum, represents a return to the "blame America first" mentality of the 1970's. The study guides that we reviewed were more than willing to excuse Soviet atrocities when they were mentioned, while blaming America for conflict and terror in the world. For instance, the *Perspectives* study guide equates the government-ordered bombing of the Korean Airliner in 1984 by Soviet fighters with the unauthorized My Lai massacre during the Vietnam conflict. Both study guides propound an obscene view of U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations by denouncing Western culture and religion as intrinsically aggressive and competitive while excusing Soviet aggressive behavior as a product of their history. We believe that any description of U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations must detail the merits of the democratic system versus the intrinsic flaws of totalitarian government.

We do not question the intent of teachers and administrators who implement the new "peace" curriculum. In most cases the teachers will not be duped by biased teachers' guides. They will not degrade their profession by imposing their personal political views on innocent students. Since we cannot ensure, however, that all teachers and administrators will be sensitive to this issue, we have a duty to take some action to ensure that a balanced view is propounded in our nation's schools.

While we want to ensure that our children will not be indoctrinated with this one-sided pacifist ideology, we respect the decentralized nature of our educational system. Our educational system performs best when parents and teachers are united in their commitment to educating our youth. While the federal government must not regulate school curricula, we have a responsibility to inform parents, teachers, and administrators of the overt political biases influencing this particular subject matter.

In an effort to fully inform parents and local leaders about the sensitive and political nature of this subject matter, we request that you use your position as Secretary of Education to monitor the implementation of the "peace" curriculum, inform local school boards of the biases of certain teachers' guides, remind teachers of the need to preserve politically neutral curricula by presenting a balanced approach, and encourage parents to become involved in the affairs of their local school board to ensure a neutral

curriculum. For our part, we will work with our state and local leaders to ensure a balanced presentation of this material and with parents to inform them of the distorted and possibly destructive influences of "peace education" in our schools.

We appreciate your prompt attention to this matter of utmost importance.

Sincerely,

William E. Dannemeyer, Fred J. Eckert, Norman D. Shumway, Howard C. Nielson, Hal Daub, Robert E. Badham, George C. Wortley, Tom Bliley, Ron Marlenee, Mark Siljander, Bob Lagomarsino, Earl Hutto, Beverly Byron, Larry E. Craig, Stan Parris, Henry J. Hyde, Marjorie S. Holt, Bob Stump, Robert K. Dornan, Bill Cobey, John Paul Hammerschmidt, Helen Delich Bentley,

Members of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,

THE SECRETARY,

Washington, DC, September 9, 1986.

Hon. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DANNEMEYER: Thank you for sharing with me your concerns about "peace education" in your letter of August 5, 1986. I am sending a similar response to the other signers of your letter.

I fully share your concerns about this sort of "peace education," both because I think the "blame America first" mentality is pernicious, and because I strongly disapprove of the attempt to politicize the classroom.

I have long subscribed to the view that schools are charged with conserving and transmitting our society's intellectual and moral traditions. Not so long ago, this view shared wide acceptance. Today, however, a minority within the education community seems to have set itself a new goal: to politicize the education curriculum. On numerous occasions since becoming Secretary of Education, I have denounced this new and deeply disturbing trend, and I shall continue doing so.

With regard to the "peace education," "peace studies," or "nuclear war education" curriculum, it is important to remember that there are many groups with varying ideologies that support such a curriculum, and that sweeping generalizations may be misleading. It is nonetheless true, I think, that much of the material that goes under the heading of "peace education" is seriously distorted in precisely the ways described in your letter. You have every reason, then, to bring your concerns to the attention of the American people, as well as to educators and public officials around the country.

For my part, I intend to continue speaking out against these destructive attempts to politicize American education. Although the actual business of choosing an education curriculum is a local rather than a Federal responsibility, Federal officials can and should contribute to the national debate about such choices.

Edmund Burke once observed, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." Similarly, the only thing necessary for the corruption of our schools for their transformation into tools for political manipulation, is for those of us who have a different view of the school's role to sit back and let it happen. Let me once again assure you that you and I share a common dedication to providing our children with a broad and balanced educa-

tion that will enable them to bring informed and critical judgment to bear on the complex issues before us today.

Thank you for sharing your concerns. I hope you will keep me informed of your efforts and let me know how I may be of assistance.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. BENNETT.

## THE DOOR OF HOPE: AN OUTLET FOR TROUBLED HASIDIC AND ORTHODOX JEWS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1986

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding strides in the area of mental health that Pesach Tikvah Mental Health Center in the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn is making.

Translated from the Hebrew, *pesach tikvah* means "door of hope." It is precisely this hope that Rabbi Chaim Stauber, the founder of the center, is offering the Williamsburg community.

As a community that has a large Orthodox and Hasidic Jewish population, Williamsburg faces a unique problem in the area of mental health. Because of the gap which often exists between traditional Orthodox Jewish religious beliefs and modern psychiatric practices, the needs of many mentally ill Orthodox Jews have not been adequately met. Now, in such a manner to permit sensitivity to the clients' sensibilities, the Pesach Tikvah Center has been able to begin to address these needs.

Today, the center provides services for those with serious physical or emotional handicaps as well as operating an outpatient counseling service that deals with a wide range of lesser problems and anxieties like marriage counseling.

The center has also had success treating Holocaust survivors and their families. As the Congressman representing the largest Orthodox Jewish community not only in the Nation, but the world—a community which has arisen from the ashes of the Holocaust—I appreciate deeply the value of such a service in my community and congratulate Rabbi Stauber on this success.

Recently, a profile of the Pesach Tikvah Center and Rabbi Stauber appeared in the New York Daily News. I would like to commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

### THE "DOOR OF HOPE"

(By Tracey Harden)

It's a beat up metal door outside a former printing plant in the shadow of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway. But to Rabbi Chaim Stauber, founder of Pesach Tikvah mental health center in the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn, it is a gateway to hope. Hence the name which, translated from the Hebrew, means "Door of Hope."

And, for the members of the Hasidic and Orthodox Jewish communities who make use of Pesach Tikvah's psychiatric and rehabilitation services, it is the only door open to them. Until now, because of the stigma

their culture attached to emotional illness, those suffering from psychological problems had no one to turn to, except their families or, maybe, the Rabbi. And, says Stauber, who has done a good deal of counseling in his 25 years as a leader in the Jewish community here, "Sometimes the Rabbi is hard-pressed for solutions."

The gap that exists between orthodox religious beliefs and modern psychiatric practices compounds the problem. "In our community, faith is deeply rooted in the consciousness and the psyche," says Stauber. "Psychiatry and psychology are seen as a means of altering that faith."

Also, he says, "The focus of psychiatry is to shed your complexes and feel good about yourself. In our religion, there are lots of things you are not supposed to do. We are supposed to repent and feel remorseful; according to modern psychiatry, that's a no-no."

There is a second door at Pesach Tikvah—behind the building, off a secluded tree-shaded street—where the more self-conscious clients and their relatives can enter. The psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker and other professionals on Pesach Tikvah's staff are sensitive to their clients' religious sensibilities. Indeed, most of the staff are themselves observant Jews.

In addition to the out-patient counseling service, a sheltered workshop helps those with serious physical or emotional handicaps. In keeping with religious teachings, a partition separates the men and women in the work area, where they perform a range of tasks, from packaging jars of honey for Rosh Hashanah to, on this day, assembling hinges for a metal stamping company. Kosher meals are served in separate men's and women's dining rooms.

Isaac, an articulate client in his early 30s who has a physical handicap and problems with interpersonal relationships, explains, "I used to go to another vocational shop but, because of cultural differences, it didn't work out. It's better here. I'm busy all day, instead of just staying home fighting with my parents."

The families stand to benefit nearly as much as the clients from Pesach Tikvah's services, says staff psychologist Elliot Kirschenbaum. "Previously, many of these people would have been at home until their families could no longer cope. Then they'd have to take them to the hospital. It was a whole cycle of events."

Though acute cases currently form the bulk of Pesach Tikvah's workload, the center is starting to see more people with everyday problems. Of the 453 patients who came to the center during a six-month period last year, the most common complaint was depression, followed by anxiety and sleep difficulties.

Kirschenbaum, an expert in adolescent psychology, says he would like to do more work with teenagers and their families. However, he recognizes the need to move cautiously in this area, given the special significance the Orthodox community places on family life.

The same goes for marriage counseling. Currently, the center does some couples' therapy, and hopes to do more. However, says Stauber, "There we're getting into the tricky areas. The institution of marriage in the Jewish faith is a very private domain."

Stauber is especially proud of the success the center has had with Holocaust survivors and their families. "People say the Holocaust was 40 years ago, it's over," he says. "But for some of our clients, the spiritual and emotional holocaust is just beginning."

Stauber describes one client who had lost his wife and children during the Holocaust. After emigrating to the United States, the man remarried and had a second family. It was only when he reached retirement, says Stauber, that the full brunt of his experience hit him. "He thought of his first family constantly," says the rabbi. "He could hear his children crying." The man found his way to Pesach Tikvah, where the mental health experts are helping him come to terms with his loss.

Pesach Tikvah also operates a community residence in Williamsburg for mentally retarded and autistic women. The organization plans to open similar community residences for emotionally and physically handicapped men and women. Applications are being accepted now.

Yet, says Stauber, "There is so much more we want to do." He adds that their organization—the mental health center in particular—is desperately in need of funding.

Although Pesach Tikvah is a non-sectarian agency, Stauber says they plan to continue focusing on the Orthodox and Hasidic communities, including the Satmar and Lubavitch sects in Brooklyn.

"As far as these people are concerned," he says, "There is no one else to do the job."

#### FOR THE CHILDREN'S SAKE

#### HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1986

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, we have few greater responsibilities than saving children's lives. One area in which we can make a dramatic difference is by earmarking foreign aid money for childhood immunizations. Vaccine-preventable diseases kill an estimated 3.5 million children each year.

The foreign aid appropriations bill which has passed the Appropriations Committee contains \$50 million for the Child Survival Fund. This money will be used for childhood immunization and other basic health measures. The comparable Senate bill provides \$75 million for these programs. I urge my House colleagues to recede to the Senate figure when they meet to resolve differences between the two bills.

I would also like to commend to my colleagues' attention a recent editorial in the *Tulsa World* which endorses this amendment. This editorial very clearly demonstrates the serious need for additional funds for childhood immunization.

The editorial follows:

#### FOR THE CHILDREN'S SAKE

When Congress returns from the Labor Day recess it will have the opportunity to vote on a bill that will save millions of lives yearly.

Rep. Tony Hall, D-Ohio, plans to introduce an amendment to transfer \$25 million from the Export-Import Bank to the Child Survival Fund. The proposal, already co-signed by 58 members of the Senate and 247 House members, would give the fund a total of \$75 million.

Of that amount, \$50 million would be used for universal child immunization and \$25 million would further oral rehydration therapy and other basic health measures worldwide.

The World Health Organization estimates that 3.5 million children die each year from six vaccine-preventable diseases. Those diseases (measles, tetanus, whooping cough, polio, diphtheria and tuberculosis) have been under control in the U.S. for years and many times we take the vaccines for granted. In less fortunate countries, however, they still are killers.

Measles alone takes some 2 million lives a year. Yet, a dose of measles vaccine is 6 cents on the world market. A full course of immunizations, from manufacture to injection, is about \$5 per child.

The Gramm-Rudman Act targets \$13 billion to be cut out of the upcoming foreign aid budget. The funds for child immunization and other health concerns are too important to be dismissed. Saving the lives of children could be the best investment in foreign aid the U.S. could make.

When budgets get tight, it's easy to cut back on charitable contributions. But, saving the lives and guaranteeing the health of millions of children a year is a wise and compassionate investment.

#### REVERSAL OF THE ARMS RACE

#### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1986

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to share with my colleagues a recent resolution passed by the city of Fremont, CA, supporting a nuclear weapons test ban. The resolution is a strong and hardhitting document calling for the President and Congress to immediately suspend all nuclear arms testing as a first step toward the reversal of the arms race.

The city of Fremont, which is in my district, is the most recent of 128 municipalities to make this plea for a halt to the arms race. This is an important and timely statement, which exemplifies the widespread support for legislation such as the five key arms control amendments recently adopted in our 1987 defense authorization bill. The fact that State and local governments increasingly feel it is their duty to address this issue should serve as a stark reminder that hope for a complete nuclear test ban is still in the hearts of many Americans.

The text of the resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FREMONT SUPPORTING A NUCLEAR WEAPONS TEST BAN

Whereas a nuclear war would result in death, injury and disease on a scale unprecedented in human history; including the probability of a nuclear winter threatening the entire global environment; and

Whereas spending for the arms race is contributing to record budget deficits that threaten our nation's economic security while programs providing essential assistance to communities and meeting human and environmental needs throughout the country are being cutback; and

Whereas a ban on nuclear testing would promote the security of the United States by constraining new developments in the United States-Soviet nuclear arms competition, by strengthening efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear



countries, and by reducing the environmental hazards of nuclear tests and nuclear waste production; and

Whereas a ban on nuclear testing would be a concrete and easily achievable first step towards a complete halt and deep reductions of ever expanding nuclear arsenals; and

Whereas a ban on nuclear testing can be verified with high confidence by a worldwide network of seismic monitors, satellites, and other verification technology operated by the United States and other nations.

Be it therefore resolved the City Council of the City of Fremont calls upon the President to immediately respond to the Soviet's

unilateral halt of testing by joining them in a mutual and verifiable suspension of testing as a first step towards freezing and reversing the arms race.

Be it further resolved this Body also calls upon the members of our Congressional delegation to support legislation that would enact a moratorium on nuclear testing, to be continued as long as the Soviets do not test.

Be it further resolved copies of this Resolution shall be forwarded to the President and to the Senators and Representatives comprising our congressional delegation.

Adopted August 12, 1986, by the City Council of the City of Fremont by the following vote, to wit:

Ayes: Mayor Morrison, Councilmembers Baker, Dutra, and Mello.

Noes: Councilmember Ball.

Absent: None.

Abstained: None.

GUS MORRISON,  
Mayor.

Attest:

SHARON WHITTEN,  
Deputy City Clerk.

Approved as to form:

ALLEN E. SPRAGUE,  
City Attorney.